



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/652,690	08/31/2000	Jeffrey L. Huckins	INTL-0454-US(P9662)	3146
75	590 04/05/2004		EXAMINER	
Timothy N Trop			SALAD, ABDULLAHI ELMI	
Trop Pruner & Suite 100	Hu PC		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
8554 Katy Freeway			2157	<u> </u>
Houston, TX	77024		DATE MAILED: 04/05/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*			- Ply
	Application	Applicant(s)	, .
Advisory Action	09/652,690	HUCKINS, JEFFREY	/ L.
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Salad E Abdullahi	2157	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence addr	ess
THE REPLY FILED 19 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TO Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply h places the applicat	to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The 	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The	g date of the final rejection HE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate of the final (opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) They raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sim	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceliNOTE:	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims	5.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		eparate, timely filed a	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: see		idered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		o issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-30</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) applied applied on is a)	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	•	
10. Other:			

Application/Control Number: 09/652,690

Art Unit: 2157

As per applicant's argument "Ito reference fail to teach controlling data storage management by a client based on a information included in a message". Examiner respectfully disagrees because Ito teaches a peripheral device functioning as a client receives a message (command) from a server to manage network resource or data storage units) (see fig. 7 and col. 6, lines 54-56).

As per applicant's argument Dan et al., does not teach defining service type and messaging identification. Examiner disagrees, because Dan et al., teaches a multicast messaging system for remotely managing group of clients (see col. 1, lines 50-67).

Applicant's response to examiner's objection to the specification because brief summary of the invention was missing is persuasive, accordingly examiner's objection to the specification is withdrawn.

Applicant's response to examiner's rejection of claims 2,12, 24, 27, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph is persuasive, accordingly the rejection of claims 2,12, 24, 27, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph is withdrawn.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100